

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the first Office Action mailed on November 5, 2004. Claims 4 and 8 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a Restriction Requirement raised by Examiner. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 remain pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in complete condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application in this regard.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,696,898. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In particular, and by way of background, the present invention is directed to a method and apparatus for regulating network access to selected functions of a controller of a machine. As recited in each of independent claims 1 and 5, the controller of the machine is coupled to a network having a web server that publishes a plurality of web screens configured to control selected functions of the controller. The network address of a user accessing the web server via the network is identified so as to restrict access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user. For example, a local user may be granted access to all of the web screens published by the web server while a remote user may be granted access to only a subset of the published web screens.

In contrast, Baker et al. is directed to a system and method that allows a network administrator or manager to restrict specific system users from accessing information from certain public or otherwise uncontrolled databases. The system of Baker et al. includes a proxy server having a processor and a relational database that are used to determine access rights for particular resources on the World Wide Web (WWW) or the Internet.

Applicant respectfully submits that Baker et al. is completely silent with respect to a machine having a controller, wherein the controller is coupled to a network having a web server that publishes a plurality of web screens configured to control the selected functions of the controller as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 5. In the system of Baker et al., the functions of the proxy server (112) are not controlled by web screens published by a web server. Rather, the functions of the proxy server (112) are controlled by operation of the processor (111) and the relational database (114) within the proxy server (112). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of independent claims 1 and 5, and claims depending therefrom, are improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing response including the amendments and remarks, this application is submitted to be in complete condition for allowance and early notice to this affect is earnestly solicited. If there is any issue that remains which may be

resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to resolve the same and expedite the allowance of this application.

Applicant does not believe that this response requires that any fees be submitted, however, if any fees are deemed necessary, these may be charged to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.



David H. Brinkman, Reg. No. 40,532

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 241-2324 - Voice
(513) 421-7269 - Facsimile